

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Jacques Pierre, #305613,)	C/A NO. 3:08-4025-CMC-JRM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
John [sic] E. Ozmint, James Simons, Jr;)	
M. Carolina Lindsey,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, filed in this court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On January 9, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this matter be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report on January 22, 2009.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by

the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Plaintiff's objections, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge and adopts the Report by reference. A prisoner does not have a constitutionally-protected liberty interest in an inmate grievance procedure. *See, e.g., Adams v. Rice*, 40 F.3d 72, 75 (4th Cir. 1994) (stating that Constitution creates no entitlement to voluntarily established grievance procedure); *Flick v. Alba*, 932 F.2d 728, 729 (8th Cir. 1991) (same). Therefore, Plaintiff's allegations that Defendants somehow failed to comply with the prison's voluntary grievance procedures does not state a due process claim.

Therefore, this matter is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
February 2, 2009

C:\Documents and Settings\Kgb07\Local Settings\Temp\notesE1EF34\08-4025 Pierre v. Ozmint adopt rr dism wo prej wo svc no constitutional violation.wpd